

**REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claims 4-10, 13-18, 23-30 and 32-50 are pending in this application. Claims 4, 13, 23, 32, 33 and 40 are independent. By this Amendment, independent claims 33 and 40 are amended and claims 47-50 are added. Support for the amendments and added claims can be found, for example, in Fig. 5 and paragraphs [0043] and [0046] of the specification. No new matter is added.

The Office Action rejects independent claims 4, 13, 23 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Raspe, U.S. Patent No. 6,775,768, in view of Nishikawa et al. ("Nishikawa"), U.S. Patent No. 7,280,245. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 4 recites a method for installing a printer driver stored on a recording medium on a computer terminal. The method includes, *inter alia*, automatically referring to regional information identifying a particular region before the printer driver is installed on the computer terminal, the regional information being set in the computer terminal in advance. Independent claims 13, 23 and 32 recite similar aspects and features.

The combination of Raspe and Nishikawa fails to disclose, and would not have rendered obvious, at least these claimed combination of features. Raspe discloses a universal boot disk including computer program that is run when the boot disk is inserted into a removable media storage device of an operating computer (see col. 4, lines 27-30). The boot disk program has flag files, including a language flag file "language.flg" located in a flags directory on the boot disk (see col. 4, lines 34-36). The Office Action asserts that the language flag file "language.flg"

corresponds to the claimed regional information identifying a particular region. The language.flg file indicates that a language has been set on the boot disk (see col. 4, line 40). If all flags are not present, the boot disk program directs control to the set-up phase of the program (see Fig. 2(b)). Otherwise, the program directs control to the start main menu phase (see step 28 of Fig. 2(a)). When the boot disk program is run in the set-up phase, the program determines whether the language.flg flag is present (see step 30 in Fig. 2(b) and col. 4, lines 50 and 51). If so, the program determines if another type of flag, e.g., a keyboard flag is present (see step 36 in Fig. 2(b)). If not, the user of the computer on which the boot disk program is running selects a language from among files on the boot disk for the computer to convey user-readable information (see step 32 in Fig. 2(b), Fig. 5 and col. 4, line 52 to col. 5, line 8). The boot disk program then writes the flag language.flg, and loads a file "language.xxx" from the boot disk containing all the individual phrases associated with that language for use with the rest of the boot disk program's display screens (see col. 6, lines 9-13).

The Office Action acknowledges that Raspe fails to disclose the language flag file ("regional information") being set in the computer terminal in advance, as recited in independent claims 4, 13, 23 and 32. The Office Action asserts that Nishikawa discloses these features and that it would have been obvious to modify Raspe's system to have the language flag files set in the computer in advance. However, if Raspe's system were modified to have the language flag files set in the computer in advance, there would be no need for the boot disk because the boot disk contains the program having the language flag files, as discussed above. Thus, the modification set forth by the Office Action would have rendered the boot disk

unsatisfactory for the intended purpose of running a program to set the language for the computer (MPEP §2143.01(V)). The Office Action fails to consider the references and claims as a whole and relies on impermissible hindsight using knowledge gleaned only from Applicant's disclosure (see MPEP §2145(X)(A)).

Thus, the combination of Raspe and Nishikawa fails to disclose, and would not have rendered obvious, the step of automatically referring to regional information identifying a particular region before the printer driver is installed on the computer terminal, the regional information being set in the computer terminal in advance, as recited in independent claim 4 and similarly recited in independent claims 13, 23 and 32. Therefore, these independent claims are patentable over the combination of Raspe and Nishikawa for at least these reasons.

In addition, nowhere does Raspe disclose installing a *printer driver* on the computer. Nishikawa also fails to disclose a method for installing a printer driver. Nishikawa simply discloses a method for controlling a peripheral device to set environmental data such as language used (see col. 2, lines 18-21). In Nishikawa, the printer driver has already been installed in the peripheral device (see col. 5, lines 58-60). Thus, independent claims 4, 13, 23 and 32 are patentable over the combination of Raspe and Nishikawa for these additional reasons.

Claims 5-10, 14-18 and 24-30 are patentable over Raspe and Nishikawa at least by virtue of their dependence from patentable independent claims 4, 13 and 23. Thus, a detailed discussion of the additional distinguishing features recited in these dependent claims is not set forth at this time.

Claims 47-50, depending from independent claims 4, 13, 23 and 32, are presented for consideration and recite that the step of automatically referring to

regional information includes automatically determining the particular region from among a plurality of different regions set in the computer terminal in advance. The combination of Raspe and Nishikawa fails to disclose, and would not have rendered obvious, these features.

As discussed above, Raspe discloses that when the boot disk program is run in the set-up phase, the program determines whether the language.flg flag is present (see step 30 in Fig. 2(b) and col. 4, lines 50 and 51). If not, *the user* of the computer on which the boot disk program is running selects the language for the computer to convey user-readable information by pressing a function-key corresponding to the desired language (see step 32 in Fig. 2(b), Fig. 5 and col. 4, lines 52-57). After *the user* has selected the desired language, the program verifies the selection, by asking *the user* to press another function key to confirm the selection (see Fig. 5 and col. 4, lines 61-67). Thus, Raspe discloses that *the user*, not the program, determines the particular language by *manually* pressing function keys before the printer driver is installed on the computer. Raspe does not disclose *automatically* determining the particular language from among a plurality of different languages set in the computer in advance before the printer driver is installed on the computer. The Office Action acknowledges that Nishikawa fails to disclose the claimed step of automatically referring to regional information. Thus, Nishikawa fails to overcome the deficiencies of Raspe. Accordingly, claims 47-50 are patentable over Raspe and Nishikawa for at least these reasons, as well as by virtue of their dependence from patentable independent claims 4, 13, 23 and 32.

The Office Action rejects independent claims 33 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Nishikawa in view of Raspe. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 33 recites a method for installing a device driver on a computer terminal. The method includes, *inter alia*, *automatically* selecting, before the device driver is installed, one of the plurality of region dependent message blocks on the basis of a region where the computer terminal belongs. Independent claim 40 recites similar aspects.

The Office Action acknowledges that Nishikawa fails to disclose selecting one of the plurality of region dependent message blocks before the device driver is installed. The Office Action asserts that these features are disclosed by Raspe. However, as discussed above, Raspe discloses that *the user* selects the particular language by *manually* pressing function keys before the printer driver is installed on the computer. Raspe does not disclose that the selection performed before the printer driver is installed on the computer is *automatically* executed.

Thus, the combination of Nishikawa and Raspe fails to disclose, and would not have rendered obvious, the step of *automatically* selecting, before the device driver is installed, one of the plurality of region dependent message blocks on the basis of a region where the computer terminal belongs, as recited in independent claim 33 and similarly recited in independent claim 40. Therefore, these independent claims are patentable over the combination of Nishikawa and Raspe for at least these reasons.

Claims 34-39 and 41-46 are patentable over the applied references at least by virtue of their dependence from patentable independent claims 33 and 40. Thus, a detailed discussion of the additional distinguishing features recited in these dependent claims is not set forth at this time.

In view of the above, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.


Should any questions arise in connection with this application or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application the undersigned respectfully requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: MAY 28, 2009

By:

  
David R. Kemeny  
Registration No. 57241

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404  
703 836 6620